

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team  
05 May 2010 at 17:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team teleconference on 05 May 2010 at 17:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-ops-20100505.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Ray Fasset – Registries  
Wolf Ulrich Knobon – ISPC  
Avri Doria – NCSG – vice chair

Staff:

Ken Bour  
Julie Hedlund  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Ron Andruff - CBUC

Coordinator: I'm sorry, this is the operator. I need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. And I'd like to introduce Ms. Gruber-White. Ma'am, you may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's GCOT Call on Wednesday, the 5th of May. We have Ray Fasset, Avri Doria, Wolf-Ulrich Knobon. From staff, we have Ken Bour, Glen DeSaintgery, Julie Hedlund and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies from Ron Andruff. And if I could just please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Ray.

Ray Fassett: Great, thank you, Gisella. All right, so thanks for joining today. And a little bit of housekeeping; as you all probably are aware of now, the - some of the recently completed work by the GCOT has been sent to the OSC. I took some time to look at it all since I was not on that last meeting and got it over to them just in the last day or so. So I think that's all been properly recorded now at the OSC level.

Now recently, there has been, I think, questions from the OSC chair, (Phillip), with regards to, you know, what's remaining or what's left for us to do. So I think I provided an email the other day - maybe it was yesterday - that stated that there are basically two sections of the rules and procedures still needing completion by the first of June, Section 3.8, that speaks to vacancies and absences.

And then we have something called a Chapter 4 with various sections, 4.1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, still needing some work on our end by June 1. And I think there's still a companion document that has to do - sort of an executive summary to do for the - what we're calling the Chapter 4. So I would like to understand if everyone is on the same page with that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I do hope so.

Ray Fassett: All right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Are you referring to that email of Ken's from Monday's (unintelligible)? It's (valuable) because Ken was sending out this email but he was referring again to his former email from middle of April, I think. So is that the statements we are talking about?

Ray Fassett: I believe so. I think there was a question on, was it 2.1 or 2.4? I had not sent that over to the OSC, so - but I have now. So I think that is now - we've got that into a sort of a status of sent to the OSC. Not yet approved by the OSC

but sent. And I guess the OSC has set for themselves an approval date of May 15 or May 14. So I think that's the email or maybe Ken can clarify.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, sure. As I understand it, the OSC has received Chapter 5, they received Section 2.1 on the term limits. And both of those have been submitted to the OSC and they both have dates. 2.4, which has to do with force feed elections, Ray, you indicated that you had sent it to (Phillip). He has not yet posted it to the OSC list. So we don't have a date on that yet. But...

Julie Hedlund: Ken, this is Julie, it did go to the list. I thought it went earlier today and you gave a date...

Ken Bour: Then, I'm out of date - hang on - thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. He did send it around for approval and - because I noted it because it's got - they're giving one more day to respond. So instead of May 14 for the other two documents, it's May 15 for the latest one.

Ken Bour: I don't see it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, it's from today.

Ken Bour: Okay. Yeah, it's not in my OSC folder, so I'll have to go hunt it down.

Ray Fassett: Okay, so that cleans up some procedural things between us and the OSC, I think, in terms of work products in their hands, which is a good thing.

Ray Fassett: So now to the task still on our plate, I think we all need a little bit of a summarization of the status of, say, vacancies and absences. I'm not sure yet what needs to be done with that or with the Chapter 4 stuff. Can anyone give an - what they think yet needs to be done here?

Julie Hedlund: Ken, did you - you had some questions that you've sent around to the team. Did you want to just repeat them here?

Ray Fassett: On 3.8?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. So yeah, so I sent an email on May 3. And that's the one that I think Wolf was referring to a second ago.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Ken Bour: In which, you know, I'm asking the team for some guidance because back in the middle of April, on the 13th, we had some back-and-forth correspondence. I think Avri sent a note with some concerns and questions, I attempted to address them. Ron participated in that. And then it was, like, well, we've - we're just - we've just gone too deep on this. And I lost - I don't really know at this point what else I should be doing.

So I'm in an awkward position here because I'm not 100% sure what issues remain or if any issues remain. There were some issues in the middle of April. Whether they have gone away or they've been addressed or whether we should go back through those emails and maybe take a deeper look at them, I don't know.

Ray Fassett: Okay, I'm sorry, I'm reading an email and I'm actually not sure what more I should be doing with respect to Chapter 4 of voting and Section 3.8 absences. There were a number of concerns raised to my latest versions circulated April 13, which I attempted to address in the list. However, the last set of comments suggest that we have drilled down much too deep.

I'm trying not to get into the mid-conversation here and try and remember what was all discussed but I personally do not have any addition changes to 3.8.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, it's Wolf speaking. Well, if I remember well, Ken, I think it came up from, you know, you were just talking about to edit the clean versions, if that's what I understood. And then you forwarded it to us and there were from your side, you made some, let me say, more minor amendments just for cleaning and maybe get - bring more clearance to some point that (unintelligible) your intentions, that's what I understood.

And then it came up to that point that somebody maybe (unintelligible) said no, okay, it seems to be - just now it is to be - to get that way much too deep, you know, and then we get too many words. We cannot solve any problem in advance, you know. And take into consideration any case which may arise. So there, it came from - so what I would like to say is then for me is the question, why shouldn't we just go back to the version we had approved before, before you started with that...

Ken Bour: This is Ken, I - I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's only my question (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Well, Wolf, I have a different understand and let me take a different shot at it. On the 13th, when I submitted the new Section 3.8 and 4...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Ken Bour: That were revised. In the email, I had said what I had done to it. And as you pointed out, there were very few - in fact, I don't think there were any substantive changes that weren't team approved.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ken Bour: The one was that Ron asked me to clarify that all subjects permitted language, which I did. I don't think it was that version that caused issues. I

think what happened is Avri and Ron and others may have read that more deeply and actually gone back and asked questions that were already in the - they weren't prompted by that version itself. They were there from before.

One of the things that also may have contributed is I wrote up this abstentions architecture document. I was trying to take a complex document that has many, many pages and try to scintillate it down to the key elements. And it may be that all that material just provoked folks to look at it a little differently than they may have seen it before. And so - but that did raise some questions that we have to take a look at. I don't - what I'm saying is it wasn't the changes that I made in those versions that caused this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay.

Ken Bour: It was the document itself and decisions that the team had already made that it's revisiting, I think.

Ray Fassett: Well, let's try this suggestion. Where can I see the language of 3.8 right now in its present form?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. If you can find on April 13...

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Ken Bour: An email from me and the subject is New Section 4 Voting and 3.8 Absences. It was sent at 1:14 Eastern time.

Ray Fassett: I got it. Okay, my apologies.

Ken Bour: Yep. It says GCOT numbers has promised the (caster) of the latest documents. Those are the current latest versions.

Ray Fassett: All right, so let's just, I mean, I don't want to revisit what's already been discussed but I think we, you know, we do have the reality of a deadline approaching on us. I don't want to produce a product just to meet a deadline; but on the other hand, if we're - if we are - if I'm also hearing that we are drilling down to succinctly or whatever, then that should not prevent us from producing a product either.

So why don't we take a look at 3.8 right now. I've got the document in front of me now. And if - I'd like to just all on Avri or Wolf; as I've said, I don't have any issues to change this document from what's been vetted already. But I would ask if there are any from Wolf or Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, this is where I read it and then brought up a bunch of questions. And then Ken - this is Avri speaking, sorry. And then Ken answered my question and I think in the process I probably got more confused than I had been before.

Ray Fassett: Okay, is it a high level question or is it...

Avri Doria: Wait a second...

Ray Fassett: More granular.

Avri Doria: It's just the - this is just the absences, right?

Ray Fassett: Yes, 3.8 absences.

Avri Doria: Okay. My number is all wrong; why is my numbering all wrong in my note?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I found your answer, Wolf speaking. We have found your answer; it was also from Tuesday, 13th of April...

Avri Doria: Yeah. But I'm referring to Numbers 5A and 5B and I'm looking at this and I don't see...

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yeah.

Avri Doria: 5A and 5B, so I'm wondering what I'm talking about. Or were there two documents?

Ken Bour: Yes, there were two documents, Avri - this is Ken.

Avri Doria: So I was commenting on the other document.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I think it's going to be hard - I'm trying to see if I can figure out which of the comments you made were related to the absences versus the other...

Avri Doria: Right. That's not it.

Ken Bour: I think the last one, Avri, that says ANV1.3.A still seems bizarre to me. That one I think relates to the absence provision.

Avri Doria: Okay, so ANV 1.3.

Ken Bour: See, what happened was you were referring to my architecture document, not the...

Avri Doria: Oh, I see.

Ken Bour: Yeah. So let's go back - we have to go back up...

Avri Doria: Let's go back to that.

Ken Bour: Yeah.



Avri Doria: The architect...

Ken Bour: And that wasn't copied here, I don't think, so...

Avri Doria: Okay, the copy's in the mail.

Ken Bour: Yeah, you called ANV...

Avri Doria: the 5 A and B would refer to, okay.

Ken Bour: All right.

Avri Doria: Now I've got it. So 5A, the voting direction requires consent disposition in the stakeholder group or constituency. Right. And okay, now I know what I was asking there. Now of course, I have to go back and see how it was written. One of the things I was saying is why are we telling the stakeholder group constituency how they have to go about directing? You know, some of these stakeholder groups, like the NCSG may have a policy group that deals with the policy issues. And because the NCSG, for example, just use it as the example, does not take generally forced votes on the councils.

We generally have a meeting a day or two before the council meeting, discuss everything that's up for a vote, get the various, you know, positions of both the council members and the people attending that conference call. And then basically, you know, leave it to the council members to make their decisions. They talk among themselves, they make their - so they may actually not end up voting as a block because NCSG has not taken the position that its council members voted the block.

So if there is to be a directed vote on someone, what would probably happen is because we've put together basically a policy committee that contains the council members plus it's going to be two representatives from the interest groups/constituencies in the group that are there to do the policy stuff.

So if we had to do something like that and direct the vote in an absence, it would be by this policy committee. It wouldn't go to, you know, the 180 some-odd members that have a totality of 300 and some-odd votes to make that kind of determination. It would go to the selected elected policy committee.

And that was the six council members or either appointed by the board or elected by the membership. And then, you know, there's the appointed representative from each of these interest groups/constituencies.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, so...

Avri Doria: That's why I was saying, we wouldn't want to direct how a stakeholder group does it.

Ray Fassett: Okay, let me understand, how are we directing the stakeholder group to do it?

Avri Doria: Well, I was reading and it says, you know, requires consensus position in stakeholder groups/constituency. And I'm looking at the architecture. Now I have to go back and map that to the document, which I haven't done. So Ken was right, I was questioning and all my comments were based on his architecture, not on the text itself.

Ray Fassett: Well, yeah, that - it is an interesting point though, you're raising. I mean, when we say, you know, requires a consensus position and you know, what is the document - what is the trail to show there was such a consensus position anyway.

And we're not going to mandate what that might be or could be at the stakeholder group level. I suppose - and this, I might be off-base - but I suppose I was kind of looking at it as, you know, if the stakeholder group is

telling their rep, we have a consensus position for you to decide as you see fit for us and that works, then that's a consensus position.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, I'll go ahead and just read - for the voting direction, I think we use the same - I'll find it though. This is just - it's one sentence, quote, "this remedy" - this happens to be voting direction - "this remedy requires that the appointing organization establishes a consensus position on the applicable council measures/motion." End quote.

There's no attempt to specify what consensus means, how they arrived at it. So I think that the - each constituency or stakeholder group would be free in their own charters or in their own bylaws to say with respect to the GNSO operating procedures, proxies and voting directions and so forth and so on, it is our intention to make consensus be the outcome of the policy committee. And that will be - once they render their decision, that will be the voting - I mean, I don't see anything that would prevent that.

Avri Doria: Okay, I guess then - this is Avri again - my issue would be with us overloading further the word consensus. In other words, you know, for example, we have consensus in the council that, you know, used to mean two-thirds and now means something very complicated of, you know, 75% of this or, you know, etcetera.

Then, for example, within NCSG again, we use both consensus and rough consensus that the executive committee makes all its decisions by full consensus, whereas the policy committee works on rough consensus. So I'm wondering if we can phrase this so that it says the stakeholder group/constituency will decide, you know, will make a - it will set a procedure or whatever for how these decisions will be made as opposed to calling a consensus. Maybe that's the crux of my issue.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'd be happy to take a shot - I think I understand the intent of the issue and I think I understand the original legal - when Dan Heller and Rob and I, you know, first began talking about all of this.

He wanted to make sure that when a councilor is being directed what to do or there is a proxy being effected that there is some, you know, it isn't just the chairman who says, do it this way, right? I mean, there's - and I think as long as we write something that makes it clear that the organization is - has a methodology by which it can do so the directing, I think that accomplishes what Dan would be interested in. And at the same time, we can avoid the word consensus.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, so that would - this is Avri again - that would work for me. (Certain if) we say, you know, that whatever the stakeholder group/constituency must make this decision by, you know, a pre-defined and approved procedure, you know, something like that. And then that works and it's just not...

Ray Fassett: At the discretion...

Avri Doria: The consensus that we have so confused...

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Avri Doria: In ICANN that it means...

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Avri Doria: So many things in so many places.

Ray Fassett: And yeah, I think you're referring to at the discretion of the stakeholder group, right, to decide those procedures?

Avri Doria: Yes. But they need to - I think one of the things that if I'm understanding Dan's point is, A, it can't be just an ad hoc decision and be - it needs to be procedurally based and not sort of, you know, so that people can go back and say, oh okay, you did it this way, that's what came out. Therefore, the decision has the proper wait because it wasn't a legitimate vote or some such thing.

Ray Fassett: Well, it seems to me that, you know, staff or Dan's department or whatever may have to review each of these procedures that each stakeholder group decides to implement to see if it qualifies or not. I mean, we can't, right, we can't.

Avri Doria: Right. And I think it's going to be - they're going to be, I mean, it's going to take a while but they're going to be folded into each of the stakeholder groups/constituencies' charters at some point.

Ray Fassett: Okay, because I think if I remember correctly though, the whole concept of the, you know, the consensus requirement, we'll call it, is what unlocked the ability for absentee voting or proxies and unlocked it, unlocked our ability to kind of go there with these rules of procedure. But that's different than us defining what, as Avri has astutely pointed out, what that means; consensus, policies or these procedures.

All we're trying to get to is autonomy on the part of the stakeholder group or constituency to decide what this is. Now whether that qualifies or not was not, you know, we're not in authority to make that determination. But we can probably imagine Dan's department might be. Have I pretty well summarized all of that?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think I understand the marking order and I think I can produce some language for the team to look at that will try to harmonize these two points of view into something that's workable. And so I've got the ball on that. And incidentally, I'll make sure that wherever we use that word consensus in

the entire document, we associate all of these together in the same way. I'll try to - I'll make sure that it's consistently stated. Because, you know, there's another spot where we talk about procedures and we use the term consensus there as well. So I'll fix them all and find a different way to say it.

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean, I found in the charter that we've been editing - this is Avri again - in NCSG. I've had to define what we mean by full consensus and such in the document because nobody knows what that word means in ICANN because we have so many meanings for it.

Ray Fassett: Yep. There was another part where we took the word consensus and changed it to agreement and I think it was in the work prioritization worked as well, for the same reasons. It's very hard to talk about it.

Ken Bour: Okay, super.

Ray Fassett: All right, is there anything else with 3.8? Any other issues with 3.8?

Avri Doria: Let's see, was there anything else in that note I wrote? Okay, there was the thing I didn't understand in 5B about one vote per councilor. Oh, that was the one where I think it was just the phrasing thing because it sounded like you could only give one proxy vote to any councilor as opposed to there needing to be a specific statement of proxy per each vote. And as in the past, you know, there sort of used to be hey, (Bill), you've got my proxy for the meeting, you know, do it.

And now what I think we're saying, if I understand this, is that for each vote to be taken there, you have been given a proxy that contains specific instructions pertaining to that vote. But the way it was written when I read it is sort of that okay, I've got one proxy, I can give that one to (Bill) and I can only give one proxy to (Bill), so now I have to give one proxy to (Mary). And then

as another vote, we'll all give that proxy to Rafik. And that's the way I interpreted it in our first reading and I may have just been brain dead at the time. But that's the point I brought up in that next question.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken and just to clarify. I think again, Avri was basing her comments on the architecture document, which I intentionally briefed. I collapsed everything down to the barest amount of words I could fine - which was still a lot. And that would have given anybody that impression.

So in this answer, I actually quoted the language from the text. And it is - and I think we - Ron has also chirped in that he agrees with my interpretation of the new and current language, which is it works this way. If a councilor is going to abstain, let's say on - let's say a council meeting, there's going to be five votes taken, okay? And the councilor is going to abstain from all five. Then those five proxies can all be registered by a single proxy councilor.

Now if two councilors say, I'm going to abstain on a same - on the same motion, then I would need two different proxies. So you can't - in other words, you can't have three councilors abstaining on a motion and use one proxy councilor to vote them all.

Avri Doria: You would need three proxy councilors.

Ken Bour: Right. But if one councilor is going to abstain on all the motions that are pending for that council meeting, then all those proxies can be vested in one individual to register them.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that's...

Ken Bour: That's the way we have it worded now.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But only one is my question. You know what I mean, to - so your example is five proxies, you know, from one councilor could be transferred to only one other councilor.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Not to - it couldn't be - and exactly on the text, it couldn't be split between several councilors.

Ken Bour: It doesn't have to be. I mean, it - so again, Councilor A is going to abstain on five motions...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ken Bour: On a particular meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ken Bour: Councilor B can be given all five proxies to register. Or if the stakeholder group thought otherwise, they could say, you know, two of those can go to Councilor B and three can go to Councilor C in our stakeholder group, that would be permitted. But what you can't - what we can't do with the current language is Councilor A and B are going to abstain on Motion 1. That will require two different councilors to register those two proxies.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So, well, it's both speaking. So I would avoid any complexity among this. So that means also in (such) cases, if one councilor is going to abstain from five votes, for example - five motions, then he - so I'm of the opinion he should count or register only one other councilor from his LG, not split that between different councilors. So why should that be allowed, you know, to split, you know, to register for two motions, let me say, one other councilor and then for the three other motions, to another councilor. Why should that...?



Avri Doria: This is Avri. I can think of two reasons why you might want to allow it. And I guess I would anticipate by sort of saying, I don't know that it would really make that much of why it makes it more difficult to split it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yeah.

Avri Doria: But one, if for example, I know that, you know, we trust (Adam) the most - let me pick a name of somebody that's not on the council so I can't be saying something bad about someone. I trust (Adam) the most but (Adam)'s going to be leaving the meeting after 40 minutes. And so, okay, you know, I'll give (Winthrop), you know, the votes to come after the 40 minutes simply because I know (Adam)'s not going to be there anymore. So that's one simple case.

In the other case, which is slightly more complex, in an NCSG environment where we've got people that have different theoretical backgrounds and we have people that take different positions. So as I say, you may find you'll have NCSG having a split vote. In that case I might sort of say, why deal logically on Vote A I agree with (Bill) but ideal logically on Vote B I agree with (Mary). And so therefore - and I want to leave them flexible because I know in a council meeting, there's lots of discussion, that's the whole point about there being free flow of information and discussion and changing motion and doing a little bit of text whittling where you have to get to the point where you have something.

So you know, well, (Bill) and I are pretty much on the same base in this place and (Mary) and I on that one, so I might want to split my vote to the people that have the same, you know, philosophical viewpoints on the issue as I do. That would be a second reason why you might want to say it makes sense to do so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, so - it's Wolf speaking again. So okay, on the (student) acceptance, is that theoretically could also be - it's between different stakeholder groups?

Avri Doria: I think you can give your proxy to anybody...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Avri Doria: That you trust. And for example, we have the problems - this is Avri again - we have the problem with giving the first rule that says, let's say four people are going to be absent from NCSG. Well, those four people can't give all their proxies to the two remaining NCSGs and I've got to find somebody else I can trust to give it to.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: All right, okay.

Ray Fassett: You might have a quorum issue to deal with first.

Avri Doria: That's - yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, as long as it is mentionable, you know, so I accept it, you know.

Avri Doria: I think - this is Avri again. I think the fact that - I think we may be the only, you know, stakeholder group that takes, you know, we're going to vote you out if you don't vote the way we like it as opposed to we're going to tell you how to vote. And ask the people at a meeting before each meeting, sort of explain how they're thinking so we can go back and forth with them and maybe change their thinking.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yep. That's your problem, Avri, you have too many members.

Avri Doria: And you know, like non-commercials everywhere, you know, the jokes made about many people; put three of them in a room and you have at least five points of view.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fassett: Okay, so is there any other outstanding or open points with 3.8?

Avri Doria: I don't think so.

Ken Bour: Well, Ray, just to clarify, she's actually not in 3.8 at the moment. Some of these are actually in Section - at - they're in the abstentions area. But that's okay, I think we understand.

Ray Fassett: All right, so - yeah, I'm trying to get finality here on 3.8 in particular. Hold on, let me...

Ken Bour: Actually, I think it probably - it'll work. The only point that she raised, I think, now that I'm looking at this again, was really the last one, which was - which dealt with absences and vacancies. But we're making good progress on these other ones because I would have come right back to them anyways. So I would suggest we keep going...

Ray Fassett: That's okay...

Ken Bour: Number six.

Ray Fassett: Just for clarity and for anybody who might listen to the recording, when you say these other ones, you're in Chapter 4?

Ken Bour: That's correct.

Avri Doria: Right, yeah.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Ken Bour: And again, her numbers - Avri's numbers are referring to the architecture numbering rather than the document numbering. And so we just have to make a quick translation there.

Avri Doria: What do you expect an architect refer to?

Ken Bour: I'm sorry, that's my attempt to at explaining the architecture of the procedures. And so I created the different numbering to the various points in the architecture.

Ray Fassett: All right, well, for my own sake of sanity here, let me just offer this out. So when I look at Chapter 4, are there any issues remaining with Section 4.1 quorum? 4.2, voting thresholds? 4.3, motions and votes; 4.4, absentee voting? I think that's what you were just saying, Ken, we were just addressing issues with 4.4 and 4.5, is that correct?

Avri Doria: I think we may have dealt with my issue. And I'm not looking at that document so I don't know what number but my issue had to do with calling abstentions (abstentions) and not calling them nos. And I'm not sure what section that would be.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Avri Doria: And I think we may have already fixed that one.

Ken Bour: Yes, this is Ken. My answer was essentially what I said earlier, that that email that I sent that contained the principles of the architecture was intended only to be a crisp outline.

Avri Doria: Right.

Ken Bour: The actual language reads as follows - and I've got it quoted here in this email I answered. "If an abstention cannot be avoided after pursuing the remedies provided in Paragraph 4.5.3, then the council may abstain from voting and that abstention will be entered into the record along with a reason."

Avri Doria: Yep.

Ken Bour: And so, yeah, hopefully that one is okay.

Avri Doria: Yep. So yeah, that ended my set of issues from way back then.

Ken Bour: And the last one - this is Ken again - the last one did relate to the absence section...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Ken Bour: It was - yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah. And we spent a whole meeting talking about that. And I admit that I still see it differently but I've accepted, you know - and we have modified things a little in that the whole motion of declaring and abstention because I'm going to be absent still struck me as - it was difficult for me to understand and accept.

Ray Fassett: What was difficult, Avri? Please say that again.

Avri Doria: The idea that I declare an abstention because I'm going to be absent. And by declaring and abstention, I therefore kick in the abstention rules that allow for the stakeholder group to substitute a vote. And we had had that notion. I think we ironed it a little bit.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, yeah, we - yeah, we had a slightly different perspective on that.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Ray Fassett: But basically we moved to understand the various implications and have the wording stay as it is now. Is that correct?

Avri Doria: I think so.

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Because I'm on the OSC also and I'll hopefully read it again...

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Avri Doria: All together.

Ray Fassett: Yep.

Avri Doria: And we'll see what discussions we'll get into there. But...

Ray Fassett: Yep.

Avri Doria: I have sort of said that, yeah, I accept it. It still feels a little strange to me...

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Avri Doria: But I accept it.

Ray Fassett: Understood, yes, I remember that, thank you. I do remember. Okay, I would, if you guys don't mind, I would just like to go back to this 3.8 because I would like to get finality to it. I only see one comment here and it's really a comment

from Ken that's on Page 4 of 6. It has to do with defining appointing organization. Have we done that? Have we decided to do that?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. It was a recommendation. I think it makes sense to do and - because otherwise, we have to find it in each section and we're - it's becoming more prevalent as the more of these procedures start to occur, having - not having to write stakeholder group and/or constituency. And sometimes it's an and sometimes it's an or and sometimes it's an and/or. If we just saw the appointing organization, it just makes it easy.

So I was hoping I could stick that up into Section 1 General and maybe just highlight it in the next revision and not make a big fuss about it.

Ray Fassett: That's an excellent suggestion. I'm sorry, Avri?

Avri Doria: Question - and I apologize for bringing up the strangeness of NCSG again but other people brought this strange stuff on us. Now in a strange case here, we have three NCSG members - councilors that while we have accepted them as ours and, you know, brought ourselves close to them, they were actually appointed by the board. So is the board the appointing organization for them and would you have to go to them if we called appointing organization?

Ray Fassett: Okay...

Avri Doria: I don't think that's...

Ray Fassett: No, this is...

Avri Doria: But it happened.

Ray Fassett: It's an interesting point.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry.

Ray Fassett: No, it's - let me see what we said.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's the non-com.

Avri Doria: Right, it's the non-com...

Ray Fassett: Is it semantics? Are we just looking for a term?

Avri Doria: I think we are, yes.

Ray Fassett: Yep.

Avri Doria: I think that's it. Because yes, the non-com is the appointing organization for three of them as well. And we're certainly not going to go to the non-com with a (unintelligible) issue.

Ray Fassett: I'm in the wrong place, no wonder I can't find it. It's going to end up being in - the language where we defined it is in Section - is in Chapter 4. So I have to open that one up, if I already have it open. Yes, I'll find it.

I wonder if we can define the term stakeholder group to also mean constituency. I know it was one blanket term that...

Avri Doria: They all are appointed by the stakeholder group, even if the way the stakeholder group did it in the case of the CSG, was to have each of the constituencies appoint two, you know. So they are of the stakeholder group and that would work for us too. Because even though they are appointed by someone else, they belong to. You know, and as I understand it, CSG has kind of done like they got this (unintelligible) and a secretary to the thing that sort of managed it all. So that makes sense.



Ray Fassett: Yeah, so that's part of the equation. And then I think another part of the equation was, what term can we use throughout these documents so that when we say stakeholder group, we also mean and/or constituency.

Julie Hedlund: Ray, this is Julie. Can I make a comment?

Ray Fassett: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: We have dealt with this issue in the constituency and stakeholder group operations work team. Because as you know, we're developing guidelines and principles for constituencies and stakeholder groups. And at the beginning of the document, we define constituencies and stakeholder groups, we say they are here and are referred to as groups unless otherwise stipulated. There's, like, one place where I think we make a distinction between the two, in which case we use the case constituency and stakeholder group. But otherwise, we use the term groups throughout.

Ray Fassett: Capital G?

Julie Hedlund: Capital G.

Ray Fassett: It works for me, it's consistent.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fassett: Okay, no objections? Ken, you okay?

Ken Bour: Can I take a look at it first and see - the reason I'm pausing a little bit here is that we - the - if a stakeholder group delegates the responsibility to the constituency to appoint the councilor, then it would be the constituency that has the obligation or the right to do voting direction and proxy, not the stakeholder group. The stakeholder group delegated its appointment to the

constituency, right? And I think this is where legal was coming from this appointing organization concept.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, I have a question. If they delegated it to the constituency, wouldn't they also - wouldn't it almost be an automatic pass through, that it's still the stakeholders but they've appointed - they've delegated it through so it falls through. But still, it's still the stakeholder group in a sense.

Ray Fassett: Or Ken, if there is a significance to the term appointing organization here, maybe we could define - still define appointing organization and then classify group to mean stakeholder group, constituency or appointing organization.

Avri Doria: Appointing organization - this is Avri again - gets confusing because that's non-com and the board as well.

Ray Fassett: I'm making a note about that.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, maybe I could indulge the teams a little bit and give me a chance to think about this a little bit, maybe make a proposal. I'm having difficulty thinking this through on the fly without...

Avri Doria: Relevant group might work too.

Ray Fassett: What was that, Avri?

Avri Doria: Relevant group, appropriate group.

Ray Fassett: Support organization - I suppose we can't use that term, right?

Avri Doria: No, that one's too big.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's Wolf speaking, so just one question to Avri. Well, I understand that we agree that the one who - the council member who is going forward to take an

absence, a leave of absence so that he has to refer to, let me say, anybody, a group concern to somebody. So my question is as we go out to the non-com appointee, what would you like to suggest to whom the non-com appointee should refer in this case?

Avri Doria: They don't have - there is...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Pardon me?

Avri Doria: There is no - I mean, I guess at a certain point, if the non-com appointee doesn't show up, I guess it will have to go to the non-com, I don't know.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. We have excluded the NCAs from participating in certain of these abstention remedies and it's written in. In fact, that was one of the changes that I added this last time and I noted it in the email. So the NCAs, you can't - there is no voting direction applicable for a voting NCA. We did allow for a proxy if the house picks the - somebody in the stakeholder group. But there is no - all - there's no temporary alternate available for NCA.

So with respect to the remedies, only proxy works for an NCA. So we don't have to worry about appointing organization because in that specific case, we identified the house as the one who would establish the proxy.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question?

Ken Bour: In the case of the board appointees - and this is why I need time to think this through and go back and read the procedure because I think we might also be safe in that. If a board appointee doesn't have a constituent - the definition of appointing organization right now says stakeholder group or constituency that appointed the councilor here and after appointing organization. Therefore, the board is not listed.

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Ken Bour: The board is not an appointing organization and therefore - but what that means I think is that the three board appointees cannot be voting directed nor can they be proxied nor can they be temporary alternated.

Avri Doria: But see, I would have problems with that in that they are members of the executive committee and they are members of the policy committee. So in terms of the structure of the NCSG, you know, that does make sense.

Ken Bour: So this is Ken. So I...

Avri Doria: Because they're all members of the group.

Ken Bour: Yeah. I made a notation on that language appointing so that - and I wrote a little comment to myself, what about the board appointees? Maybe we could footnote that in the procedures in the section - in this Section 4.5. And in the footnote we can say that for the purposes of these procedures, the board appointees are considered members of the NCSG...

Avri Doria: Yep, they are.

Ken Bour: Yes. And that - then that automatically makes the NCSG the appointing organization.

Avri Doria: If that works, that works, yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Well, as to (unintelligible) - Wolf speaking. So why don't we deliver in this case just to the house instead of the appointing organization in any case? I'm wondering, you know, whether the appointing or any kind of organization which really the council member may come from or has been appointed or has been, what we say, put to the council. If you know, for me, the best way

would be if an organization our council, whatever, could take this kind of mold or this kind of requirement, you know, accept this requirement. Why not the house themselves?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Wolf, I think we would run into trouble there because if a councilor is going to abstain and is looking for direction, you don't want them to have to go to the house to get it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: No, no, no, I'm sorry. So maybe I misinterpreted this part totally. The leave of absence, is it in connection with abstention? I'm sorry about that.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry, this is Ken. I don't think we were talking about leave of absence at that point. We were in the abstention remedies is where I was.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I was talking to the part of leave of absence as the same thing, it's called appointing organization. I'm sorry about that.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken. What I think - what I'd like to try to do is to deal with this question of appointing organization earlier in the GNSO operating procedures, maybe in Section 1 General, whatever it's called and make the definition there and footnote it there so it's clear the board appointees are members of the NCSG for the purposes.

And then down the road, when they're no longer board appointees on the council, we can take the footnote out.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So I'm in the wrong document right now, I'm sorry.

Ken Bour: Yes - but you're - actually, it's fine because I think we have to - wherever the term appointing organization is used, then it's used in Section 3.8 and in Section 4.5 and maybe elsewhere. It needs to have a reference earlier in the document rather - otherwise we have to repeat it every time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sure.

Ken Bour: And so I'll take the responsibility of making sure that we get the term defined properly and then footnoted so that wherever we use it in Section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 - because there are lots of procedures coming - that it will always be defined.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But it may be handled a different way, as I just pointed out because - with regards to leave of absence, it may be different from that of - in the case of abstentions so that, you know, with regards to houses or appointing only (unintelligible) or what else, yeah? So we should think about that. You understood what I meant?

Ken Bour: This is Ken, no, I'm not sure that I get the distinction to how a leave of absence might be different in terms of the use of the word appointing organization.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, leave of absence, you know, the question of whether a leave of absence is requested or a kind of abstention is requested, if it's of different value for me. You know, absence means - I understand, you know, it's a question of about a councilor being attending a meeting or not, yeah?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I absolutely agree with you that a leave of absence and an abstention are completely different animals. But what I think is the same in both cases are the available remedies that are referenced in Section 4.5. So regardless of whether somebody is abstaining or taking a leave of absence, there are certain remedies that apply and the appointing organization gets to make those decisions pursuant to the rules.

And so I think we can use appointing organization for both cases and not get into trouble, even though I agree with you that the causes of the need for the remedy are completely different.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fassett: It's a good discussion but I think that was well said there, Ken. Okay, so I'm going to ask if there are anything else with 3.8. We've got an open point here with regards to definitions. Anything else with 3.8 that anybody has? Going once, going twice? Okay, so upon I think getting that language clarification from Ken, which we certainly appreciate, we'll look at it. And unless any last call changes or further discussion we will consider 3.8 a document to be sent over to the OSC. Is that correct? Any objections?

Okay, so why don't we move on to...

Ken Bour: Ray, I hate to put a (cotisole) on that definitive closure statement but I would recommend that 3.8 and 4 go together.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Ken Bour: Only because they refer to each other. And so if you sent 3.8, 3.8 is going to say, apply the remedies in Section 4.5. Well, they haven't gotten 4.5 and won't be able to look at them.

Ray Fassett: All right, fair enough. That's a very valid point. Okay, so let's look at 4 now. We've addressed a couple of those concerns, correct, with earlier discussion. I am looking at the most recent draft that I can read through here and there are lots of edits in here and I like the edits. What discussion points do anybody - does anybody have?

Avri Doria: Can you tell us what the - what's the latest draft of that one is?

Ray Fassett: Sure.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken, I can help there. It was - I referred to it earlier. It's the April 13 email...

Avri Doria: It's the same one.

Ken Bour: It says new Section 4 voting and 3.8 absences.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Ken Bour: And there were two Word documents attached to it and we're looking at...

Avri Doria: The one that says ops procedures. Yeah, okay...

Ken Bour: Yep.

Avri Doria: Got it.

Ken Bour: Perfect. This is Ken. What I did mostly in this version was to put the absentee voting material back the way it was. I made some changes structurally to the section but I tried to honor the team's desire not to extend absentee voting beyond where it is today. And I made some wording changes there to just be a bit more consistent.

Ray Fassett: I think there also are some clarification language in there as well, such as 4.43. That proves the document.

Avri Doria: Yep.

Ray Fassett: So I think it's been sharpened, is what I'm trying to say, to the good. So okay, Avri?

Ken Bour: No, it was me - that was Ken...

Ray Fassett: Okay, Ken.



Ken Bour: That breathed. The only point that I would raise is my comment on the meeting's adjournment. Originally it was the start of the meeting. But it makes more sense to me that we would start 72 hours from the termination of the meeting. Because presumably while the meeting's going on, somebody could still vote, right? An absentee ballot would only occur when the meeting's over.

Ray Fassett: Right, that's Section 4.42?

Ken Bour: Mm-hmm.

Ray Fassett: All right.

Ken Bour: I don't know if anybody sees bad logic there.

Ray Fassett: No, I don't.

Avri Doria: I think except for the marathon Wednesday morning meeting, it's probably not that big an issue, one or two hour difference.

Julie Hedlund: For those meetings, it could be six hours.

Avri Doria: Yeah, maybe (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, wait, I'm sorry, I have a hard (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) and I have to leave.

Ray Fassett: That's okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I...

Ray Fassett: I want to do just one...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I don't have any big problems.

Ray Fassett: All right, well, we've got to do just one quick bit of housekeeping here, Wolf, before you go. We have one meeting before the 1st, which is the 19th. So I think that we are, you know, we're very close here on getting these sessions done. We know where 3.8 is, I think we're very clear. We agree 3.8 does need to go in tandem with Chapter 4. I think we all can see what is going on here with Chapter 4. Some of the comments Ken has made, where we are at - I think we're all on the same page. Where is it and why? And I see no reason for us on the 19th - on the 19th call - to be ready to send over to the OSC both 3.8 and Chapter 4. And I would like us to make that a goal of completion on the 19th call.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fassett: Now one last open point I have is this executive summary document. What is our plans on that.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I would be happy to - I don't think it requires much more than dusting off because we haven't done anything fundamentally different with the architecture of the abstention procedures. And so I can go back and look at that. If we want to resend it to the OSC; I don't know if it's necessary. But if you wanted to kind of refresh their memories as to why we're doing all this work, we could, you know, I can say dust it off.

Ray Fassett: Okay, so then on a priority level, definitely 3.8 and 4, get those done and send over in tandem. And then the executive summary, we can look at that from there.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So I have to leave then.

Ray Fassett: Okay, thank you. Okay.

Ken Bour: Bye, Wolf.

Avri Doria: So this is the question - this is Avri again. And other than that, we're done?

Ray Fassett: Other than that, we have met our June 1 obligations.

Avri Doria: Okay. And we have no other work?

Ray Fassett: Well, we will be disbanded at that moment.

Avri Doria: Way cool.

Ray Fassett: Unless called upon for future damage, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Ray, this is Julie. You know, of course, OSC can come back with changes and the council can come back with changes. But hopefully that won't happen, right?

Ray Fassett: Yeah, so that has been kind of the way it's gone. We submit things to the OSC, they come back with positive and constructive thoughts and feedback and we adjust. So we should anticipate that. I'm just saying that I think on the 19th - and we're actually giving - if we do good and your chair gets things over to the OSC timely, we - we actually will give them some time to look at this stuff before June 1 rather than deliver it to them on June 1.

Ken Bour: Yeah, Ray, this is Ken. And of course, we remember that we already sent the abstention procedures to the OSC. The OSC had a lot of comments in Nairobi and we made a change - adjustments to the language, especially to some comments made by (Steve Metal) and others. And that would be part of the dusting off of executive summary, right, is these were some changes made since the time you left and looked at this document.

Ray Fassett: All right.

Ken Bour: So I would think that we are in good shape with respect to the abstention procedures.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Ken Bour: The absences might require a little bit of explanation as to how we got there.

Ray Fassett: Okay, fair enough. All right, so - yes.

Avri Doria: One of the pieces we were forgetting, that's all.

Ray Fassett: What's that, Avri?

Avri Doria: I just wanted to make sure there weren't any other pieces to the document we were forgetting.

Ray Fassett: Right, right.

Avri Doria: Cool.

Ray Fassett: So I think we're all on the same page.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Ray Fassett: So let's see...

Ken Bour: Do you want to keep sliding through Section 4.5 a little bit and just see what other changes I made, Ray? This is Ken.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, I would, as a matter of fact, if others have the time. I'd like to spend about 15 minutes on that. Would anybody mind? Avri, do you have the time, 15 minutes?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I have it.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, fine with me. This is Julie.

Ray Fassett: Julie, good. So probably, Ken, are you going to Page 7 of 19, that's, let's see, Section 4.52 before B? Is that where you're heading.

Ken Bour: Yes, well - yes, anywhere you see red language changes, these are all slight, what I hope were improvements to the original text.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, so I see some polishing going on. And I think, you know, based on our experience and reading through it myself, I'm not - I don't think we need to spend time on the polishing language.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Ray Fassett: But then there's a couple of comments, what's called - yeah, the comment areas, like K before, as I see it. Now you're bringing up an issue, which is a little different. So do we - is that what you would like to do? Discuss some of these issues?

Ken Bour: And in fact, I'm happy to - yeah, that one's going to be fairly easy unless you - unless Avri has a different point of view. Ron commented on that comment by saying no, please, let's do not add anymore tightening to the language we already have. And so if you and Avri are okay with that, I can just delete that comment.

Ray Fassett: Yes I am, as a matter of fact.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I was trying to find places in the document where I saw email concerns raised and areas that we might decide to make things tighter.

Ray Fassett: Avri, how you feel?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm fine.

Ray Fassett: Okay, good. So I page through these - through further, again I see a lot of polishing and sharpening, which is good. And then I get to KB5.

Ken Bour: Okay. I just deleted that, so that's four for me.

Ray Fassett: It falls under temporary alternate.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry, I added another comment about the board appointees and also rewriting the consensus language. So let me just slide down; you're on temporary alternate, okay.

Yes, I - when I was working on the absences language, I had exclusions in there about - that the NCAs couldn't work - couldn't do the temporary alternate method because they don't have an appointing organization. And that was not included in Section 4 and I thought it was important to put it in here.

Ray Fassett: Okay. Avri, you okay with that?

Avri Doria: Yep.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Avri Doria: You know me, I'll say something if I'm not.

Ray Fassett: Okay. All right, so I just looked at - let's just look at the polishing going on in what is 4.53C4, yes, that's right, you read my mind here. Look at that polishing here because is it polishing or are we - is it something a little more sensitive than that? So let's read that. I'll read it. "The presence of a dually recognized temporary alternate at a council meeting is counted in quorum

calculations; however, the regular councilor if present and any temporary alternate only contribute a count of one to the meeting quorum.”

Ken Bour: This is Ken. So it occurred to me as I was going through this that you could have a temporary alternate assigned to vote for a councilor who's also at the meeting. And therefore - and temporary alternates we said count in the quorum. Well does the regular councilor and the temporary alternate both count in the quorum? No. And that - so I put that clause in there to make it clear. If you're going to count for a vote the temporary alternate, you can't also count the regular councilor if he or she happens to be present.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, that's the spirit of it, right?

Ken Bour: But these are the kinds of things that cause more words to be added.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, you try to track for it right, right, right. So I think that's a healthy add. I don't - I say it's a healthy add. All right, so - and I'm not hearing Avri so I think it's okay. It's not harmful, let's put it that way.

Looking at Number 5, I think that's just sharper language. All right, if we don't mind, let's go to KAB6. Well, what I have is KAB6, which falls under number 6, beginning with the above remedies.

So Ken's comment here, I'll read it. "Based upon GCOT discussions, perhaps we should not include a quote/unquote end will so that there's not an expectation that SGCs must always pursue a remedy.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. So to clarify, I took the letter - the language and wheel out in respect of the GCOT's conversations that we don't want to mandate that every vote must be remedied. So if you have a situation where the council has tried to approve the minutes of a meeting and there's an abstention for some reason, because the council didn't attend the meeting, there's not requirements - that means end will - there's no requirement to remedy that.

The stakeholder group or the appointing organization can remedy it but doesn't have to remedy it. And that was the change I tried to make in light of that discussion.

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri. And that's definitely something I support because to see this whole heavy weight stuff put on things like approving minutes was one of the things that had been sort of worrisome to me. So yeah, I think that that's a good change.

Ray Fassett: I support that as well. Very good thinking, Ken. Okay, so moving on here. I don't see - I don't have anything further to go through this document substantively speaking. Here is my suggestion. Let's go ahead and accept all changes to this document. What are the open points remaining substantively?

Ken Bour: I like - Ray, this is Ken. I see where you're going and I would - this is how I would say it. I should accept all the changes except the things that I am going to now change...

Ray Fassett: Yeah.

Ken Bour: That relates to the redefinition of consensus. So everything that we've already discussed will have - will disappear and we'll only be looking at the changes that relate to appointing organization or consensus. But just the things we've talked about today that need to be...

Ray Fassett: Yes.

Ken Bour: Amended. Okay.

Ray Fassett: That's what I'm suggesting.



Ken Bour: Yeah, I can do that.

Ray Fassett: Avri, any objections to that notion?

Avri Doria: No, I think that's good. Then, you know, I think it'll probably be worth giving it a read through to 3 and 4, just for sanity and consistency's sake, you know, to make sure all those many things we've juggled actually do make sense.

Ray Fassett: Yes, yes, you're right. They go hand in hand. All right, so I think we're on path now to set as a goal on the - what date did I say our next meeting is when, the 19th, right? So I think we're on a path here to get a - be at a rough consensus position to use Avri's favorite term, to get completed documents over to the OSC.

Ken Bour: And this is Ken. My thanks to you all for -this is exactly the kind of guidance I was looking for and I really appreciate it.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, so that's what I was just going to close the meeting with, is I think if nothing else, we've answered the question of I am honestly not sure what more I should be doing with respect to Chapter 4 voting and Section 3.8. You've got your marching orders, huh?

Ken Bour: I do, thank you.

Ray Fassett: Well, thank you, Ken, for all the hard work and being able to tie it all back together for us as well as we try to, at least me, go through the cobwebs and figure out what was going on. You really are - beyond your expertise, you are beyond your grounding, if you will, to be able to bring it all back together. Okay?

Ken Bour: Glad to be of service.

Ray Fassett: With that, I would like to ask if it's okay to adjourn the call, if there's any other business and end the recording. I don't think that's in the right order. Any other business?

Avri Doria: Nope.

Ray Fassett: If no, I ask to adjourn the call and end the recording.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thank you very much everyone. Appreciate it.

Ray Fassett: Thank you.

Ken Bour: Thanks.

Woman: All right.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye-bye everyone.

END